

# The Independent.

VOL. XIV.

LINCOLN, NEB., DEC. 11, 1902.

No. 29.

## FEATURELESS

Little of Special Importance Being Done by Congress—Mr. Risley Renews His Regular Correspondence

Washington, D. C., Dec. 8, 1902.—(Special Correspondence.)—The opening of the last half of the Fifty-seventh congress is a matter of history characterized by no special features save the presence in the private gallery of the house of the president's wife and daughter.

In the senate, General Alger was sworn in as the new member from Michigan, vice McMillan, deceased, and the "embalmed beef" that our soldiers had to eat in Cuba and the other islands received a second official indorsement.

The first day's session was short in both branches, adjournments being shortly taken out of respect to deceased members, seven members of the house (all democrats) and one senator (McMillan, republican) having died since the beginning of this congress.

The second day was consumed in the reading of the president's annual message, a document, judging from expressions heard, very pleasing to republicans, and at least not distasteful to the opposition. A state paper of eight columns in length, containing not more than two direct recommendations (one for the creation of a department of commerce, and another to place hard coal on the free list) could not be expected to draw very heavy fire from the enemy's guns.

Rhetorically, the message is creditable—unique in that strenuous way of continually harping upon a few stock phrases of "duty" and "opportunity" and "work" and "sturdy self-reliance" and "destiny"—and distinctly Rooseveltish in charging everybody with weakness and cowardice who happens not to agree with the administration's program.

I used to think McKinley had the faculty of saying more and meaning less in a few words than any public man of recent years, but as an adept at dodging every public proposition that might prove an obstacle in a second-term path, the present executive makes them all look like 30 cents.

He opposed tariff revision until it can be proven that a schedule favors monopoly and then he wants the monopoly receiving the benefits to be the judge as to when that time comes.

On the trust question he is so fearful some good trust will be injured that he considers it dangerous to attempt any restraint of the bad ones. Therefore, "let well enough alone"—which, translated, means do nothing, may be looked for as the official program.

His felicitations to the country upon colonialism in the Orient are not reasonable had we due care for public expense. Even the "glory" of compelling the obedience of unwilling subjects will not compensate the depletion of our own and the island treasuries to maintain this farce of world-powerfulness.

Every new message to congress seems to remind us that the writer yields to the commercialistic spirit of the times and gives little concern to that higher standard of national existence which in all ages has been the inspiration of the poets, the philosophers, the scientists, the students and the history-makers of mankind.

The Littlefield publicity bill, as amended and reported favorably yesterday by the sub-committee that had had it under consideration, provides that every corporation, joint stock company, or similar organization engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, and every such corporation which shall be hereafter organized, shall file with the interstate commerce commission on or before September 1 each year a return, stating, among other things, its name, date of organization, where and when organized, the statutes under which organized, and if consolidated, the names of the constituent companies, and the same information concerning them. If the concerns have been reorganized the original corporation or corporations is to be stated with information concerning them.

It is also provided that the amount of authorized capital stock, shares into which divided per value, whether common or preferred, and distinction between each, amount issued and out-

standing, amount paid in—how much, if any, paid in cash, and how much, if any, in property, and if paid in property, a description and cash market value of the property at the time it was received in payment shall be stated. The indebtedness, its nature, and for what purpose incurred are to be given, also a statement of the assets at their present cash market value, giving the elements upon which the market value is based.

It also is required that the total earnings and income, operating expenses, interest, taxes, permanent improvements, net earnings, dividends declared, with rate and date during the year preceding the first of the preceding July, salaries of officials and wages of employes be disclosed.

It is provided further that the treasurer or other officer of concerns affected by the bill having the requisite knowledge shall answer on oath all inquiries that may be made in writing under the direction of the interstate commerce commission, relative to its financial condition or to its capital stock. Such answer is not to be used as evidence against the person making it, except in prosecutions under the proposed act.

A tax of 1 per cent per annum is imposed on so much of the capital stock outstanding which is not fully paid in cash, or other property, at its full cash market value, and provision is made for collecting the tax.

Any concern contemplated in this bill failing to make the return as required under this bill, and any concern failing to pay a tax imposed, is to be restrained on the suit of the United States, from engaging in interstate or foreign commerce. It is made the duty of the attorney general, at the request of the interstate commerce commission, to enforce the provisions of the proposed act, and suit may be brought in any district court of the United States, at the election of the attorney general, where an offending concern has a place of business.

Provision is made that the interstate commerce commission shall prepare and publish a statement showing a list of corporations and disclosing their condition. The bill does not apply to any concern the amount of capital stock of which does not exceed \$500,000.

Secretary Shaw, in his annual report just out, recommends an asset currency issued by the banks (based alone upon bank securities) and the redemption of silver dollars in gold. These two are features of the Fowler bill now pending in congress. A third feature—branch banks—Mr. Shaw says he is not as yet prepared to recommend. The recommendation is only delayed out of fear of the wrath of the small country banker, but the people may be assured that the whole Fowler bill will be engrafted into law, even though it come a seeming trifle at a time.

And the people have no right to complain if they get what they voted for!

About \$29.50 is the present per capita circulation of money in the country—about one-third more than when McKinley took the oath of office. In 1896 the bimetalists said the need of the country—the sure harbinger of prosperity—was more money. Who was right? And the vindication came within five years!

The house on Wednesday passed a bill appropriating \$50,000 to pay the expenses of the anthracite coal commission, unanimously. The expenses of "commissions" come high, and a new commission is appointed for some purpose or another about every change of the moon.

The omnibus statehood bill, to admit Oklahoma, New Mexico and Arizona to the union and place three new stars on the flag, is receiving senatorial consideration. The republican majority is naturally opposed thereto, and proposes a substitute to admit Oklahoma and Indian territory as one state, and cut out the other two for fear they might choose a democratic representation in congress.

The republican leaders in Nebraska in the last election declared a town an individual, a community, must be republican to secure justice from congress, and even then not unless the congressman from that district was a republican. That's the situation in which New Mexico and Arizona find themselves this day.

H. W. RISLEY.

## A DIVIDED HOUSE

Reorganizers and Bryan Democrats Never Will Work in Harmony—One Must Control and the Other Get Out

Editor Independent: The late election demonstrates—that some of us have believed ever since 1896, and what everybody ought to have known—that the two elements of the democratic party will not be harmonized so that they will ever operate together. It is a house divided against itself, and in the nature of things cannot stand. If the Hill-Cleveland-Gorman-Olney - McLean - Watterson-National Bank element have at any time really expected that they could induce the element represented by Mr. Bryan to give up their belief in the declarations in the Chicago and Kansas City platforms, the expectation was ridiculously absurd. That expectation was not, however, a whit more ridiculous or more absurd than was the expectation of Mr. Bryan's democratic friends that the men, who pretended to be democrats in 1896, but caused his defeat, would be true to him in 1900.

One of two things must occur and will occur. Either Mr. Bryan's democratic friends must take possession of the party organization to the absolute and complete exclusion of the other element, or they must abandon the organization and the party name to the Cleveland crowd, and get away from them entirely. If the first is to occur, then it is not only a question of control of the party organization, but how best and most effectually to drive out and keep out every one of the traitors of 1896 and 1900. There ought to be no room, and must be none, in the counsels of the party for any man who, in 1896 or 1900, pretended to be a democrat, and yet openly or secretly supported the republican ticket by a direct vote, or supported it indirectly by voting for Palmer and Buckner.

I can respect the man, however much I may disagree with him, who abandons his party because its declarations of principles and purposes are not in accord with his convictions; but the man who remains with his party under such circumstances and demands recognition as a member of it, is entitled to no respect from anybody. The man who in the last two national campaigns claimed to be a democrat and took part in its organizations and at the same time assisted in its defeat, directly or indirectly, was a traitor not only to his party, but to the right. Such a man is wanting in the fundamental instincts of common honesty.

During the campaign of 1896, there were in a certain precinct in the Second ward of this city (Indianapolis) nineteen men who made themselves very conspicuous by their pretended earnestness in advocating the Palmer and Buckner ticket. They were well known, so-called national democrats who were exceedingly anxious about the honor of the party and the preservation of democratic principles. Every one of them voted in the precinct to which I refer. There was but one Palmer and Buckner vote in the box. Before this fact was known, a member of the election board interviewed each one of the nineteen separately, and every one claimed to have voted the Palmer and Buckner ticket. Some of them expressed a willingness to swear to it. Whether any one of the nineteen cast the one vote that was in that box is very doubtful. Without question eighteen of these men voted the republican ticket. I know every one of these men. In 1900, and again this year, they were conspicuous as democrats, professing a self-sacrificing loyalty to party, notwithstanding the great mistake (?) the party made at Chicago and at Kansas City. In 1900 it was a blunder to put any reliance in the professions and promises of such men. It was worse than a blunder to take them into the counsels of the party, and give them conspicuous places (as was done) in the party organizations, and in the management of the campaign. By confession they were untrue to themselves in supporting declarations of principles that they did not believe to be right. By confession they were traitors to their own convictions, with no excuse but pretended loyalty to the party name.

What nonsense it was to expect men, who confessed disloyalty to their own ideas of right, to be loyal to a name. The nineteen men to whom I have referred, and many others like them, were political decoy ducks. They were deliberately attempting to create dissension among their own party associates that the enemy might be profited thereby. This is the class of men that has very largely had control of the party organization this year. This is the class of men that has been so sure that there would be harmony and success, if only the party could get rid of Bryan and the populists. This was the burden of their song.

Such men were not controlled by any political principle, and very naturally assumed that no one else could be. They rejoiced at the defeat of Mr. Bryan in 1900 because they thought that defeat finally disposed of him as a political factor. They have been foolish enough to suppose that all they had to do was to have one of the aristocratic clubs to have a banquet somewhere in New York, and trot out Cleveland for a speech, then send the secretary of the Boston Free Trade League or Indianapolis to have another banquet at the Grand hotel, at which should be present only those who would not mention Mr. Bryan's name, then give a few whoops for the old party and undesignated democratic principles, and that everybody who voted for Bryan would go trooping after them like a flock of fool sheep after the bell wether. It did not work, and it never will. This is the one encouraging thing demonstrated by the late election. The stunning defeat, caused more by the loss of the populists and the silver republicans, and the disgust in the ranks of their own party, than by any increased strength of the republican party, seems to have paralyzed their tongues so that they have not since been able to use them, except to snarl and growl.

Now what is the situation? Is it not perfectly clear that such men have been more in sympathy with the purposes of the republican party than with the declarations of the democratic party? It is manifestly certain that, if they cannot induce the democratic party to abandon the declarations of 1896 and 1900, they will continue to prefer the success of the republican party, and will in every campaign, wherever given the opportunity, betray their own party to bring about that success, just as they have heretofore done. Any man of intelligence knows that if every man who called himself a democrat had supported that party, Mr. Bryan would have been elected. They did not support the party, and they never will unless the party abandons its position on the financial question. This election demonstrates that the voters many of them, are not ready to pay the price demanded. Very certain it is, the populists and those who left the republican party, and gave their support to Mr. Bryan in two campaigns on this question, cannot, without stultification, support the party with such votaries of plutocracy as Cleveland and Hill at the head of its column, either as leaders or "honor'd guests."

The "favorite assertion with this element now is, that the money question is a dead issue. Well, if they are really sincere about that, it is very strange that sensible men should be so terribly afraid of a corpse. They are not sincere. The money question is not dead. It is not a dead issue. It is the question that is at the bottom of, and that gives life to, every other possible question in our politics. No man knows this better than such men as Cleveland and Hill, and the more intelligent part of their following.

The party never will succeed again with such men in it. Can the party get rid of them? I suppose the question ought to be put in this way. Will the party get rid of them? When put in this form I am constrained to express the opinion in answer that it never will. I am forced to the conclusion that those, who believe in the declarations of the Chicago and Kansas City platforms on the money question, will not be able to cleanse the old party hulk from these barnacles. There are too many who are more concerned about party than about the success of any principle it has declared. The party put its hands to the plow in 1896, and made its campaign distinctly and specifically on the money question. If it had not been betrayed by so-called democrats, it would, with the aid of the two million and more votes outside of the party, have succeeded. If it looks backward now it is doomed. No more disastrous mistake was ever made, in a political